

□ 1300

We know without a doubt that for every \$1 we put into prenatal care, much of it is nutritional services to make sure that women are healthy, that babies are healthy. For every \$1 we put into prenatal care we know we save more than \$6 immediately in intensive care costs, many times related to low birthweight babies.

The WIC Program works. It is one that makes sense. It ought not to be a partisan issue. I would strongly urge that my colleagues in the majority come back with a process that we can all support to guarantee WIC funding.

I also need to respond as a member of the Committee on Agriculture for just a moment, because in addition to providing direct nutritional food and services for women and children to guarantee that they are healthy and have a good start in life, this is also a wonderful opportunity to provide additional markets for agricultural products.

Michigan is strong in agriculture. We have more agricultural products that we grow than almost any other State in the Union. We are very proud of the fact that Michigan farmers have expanded markets for fresh produce through the farmers market nutrition program, which in Michigan we call Project Fresh. This is a way for our farmers to provide fresh vegetables, fresh fruit, to women and children who are in need of that, and it also allows them to have another market for their goods, so it works on all accounts.

It is good for agriculture, it is good for families, it saves costs on health care, and I am very hopeful and urge that our colleagues who are determining the way to proceed on the rules regarding WIC funding will come back with an open process that we can embrace in a bipartisan way to guarantee that one of the most cost-effective and one of the most commonsense programs provided through Government, the WIC Program, is allowed to continue in a way that would allow our women and children in this country to be healthy.

#### WILL COCKROACHES BECOME PROTECTED UNDER THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I think we should stop the presses. It appears that the EPA has their facts wrong again. After weeks of chatter about proposed new clean air standards and their urgent necessity, this week we find out that the EPA has been given some incorrect or bogus data, certainly very questionable.

First, they cried that 20,000 people are killed every year by PM 2.5 pollution. Then it was revised to 15,000. The EPA Administrator, Ms. Browner, pa-

raded before the Committee on Appropriations and my subcommittee to tell us how important these tough standards are and why they were needed.

Now we find out it is not 20,000, not even 15,000 lives that are at stake, that we are not even clear as to how many there are. In fact, scientist K. Jones, whose name appears along with some commentary in yesterday's Congress Daily, suggests that because of inadequate research, that EPA's first revision of their data now shows it could be below 1,000, less than 1,000 people are affected by the finer particulate matter pollution.

What is the EPA going to do now that this information has emerged? I believe they are hell-bent on imposing tougher clean air standards on our communities, businesses, and residences, even though the air quality across the country, across America, has improved immensely since we began this quest. After Mr. Jones, a scientist, caught them in their first mistake, how can we really trust the EPA data now when billions of dollars in costs are at stake for our communities?

I believe we have to get the facts straight before asking our local communities to pay up for costly regulatory reform. Also I might add, in addition, this week the New England Journal of Medicine, which is often quoted certainly by EPA as their source, has, it seems, driven another stake into the EPA drive to impose costly tougher air quality standards on us.

After hearing about how many children, for example, are hurt by PM 2.5, this Nation's most respected health journal reports that cockroaches are more of a problem than the air. That is right, cockroaches. The study, and it was not just a short-term study, it was for 10 years, focused on children and found that those exposed to cockroaches are more likely to suffer from asthma. They are over three times more likely to be hospitalized, and 80 percent more likely to have unscheduled doctor visits for asthma. Yet the EPA says it is not the bugs, it is the air. Our communities, businesses, and people are still going to be stuck with the EPA's bill.

I just hope as we rid our communities of the roaches to fight asthma, they do not become protected under the Endangered Species Act.

Let us get the facts straight before we impose new air standards on our communities. One scientist suggests there should be a 5-year moratorium, a 5-year study, before we present any facts, any conclusions.

The EPA seems determined in spite of the conflicting data to move ahead. They seem to have a sense of urgency that is wrapped up in the willingness to accept anything, any information that will justify their personal proposal, their own idea, about what is the proper proposal. They ignore, along the way, common sense and cost as part of the equation.

#### DEVASTATION CAUSED BY FLOODING OF THE RED RIVER IN NORTH DAKOTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I represent the State of North Dakota. I am the only Representative in Congress that North Dakota has. It is my responsibility to advocate for North Dakota at a time when we are reeling from the worst natural disaster we have ever experienced.

Many of the Members are aware of the pain that we have suffered in light of the floods of the Red River this spring. The national media coverage has documented the destruction of the city of Grand Forks, N.D. These pictures, I believe, tell what words cannot in terms of just what a devastating event this was.

This is a street sign at the corner of Fourth Street and Eighth Avenue. You can see the water right up to the bottom of the sign. At this juncture the water was literally in excess of 6 feet, flooding neighborhoods, street after street after street. Even in areas of town that were not hit with this depth of water, the water still was sufficient to fill basements and come up on the main floor. We are still dealing with the devastation that flood water causes to homes and personal belongings.

At a time when we thought things could not get any worse, they did get worse. Fires broke out in downtown Grand Forks, destroying our historic business district. Eleven buildings burned. A fireman who fought the fire explained it this way. He said it was so unusual, because water is usually the fireman's friend. "In this instance it prevented us from stopping the destruction of these buildings. We were simply incapable of getting our equipment to the fire. Then when we dove below the water to hook up the hoses to the hydrants, water pressure had failed and we had to stand by and watch the buildings burn."

The net result was reflected by this picture, a business district in smoldering ruin, a city standing in water. The water has receded, and the picture that we would see in Grand Forks if we drove around the neighborhoods today is of huge mounds; not mounds of snow that we often see during some of our winters, but mounds of wet, wrecked sheet rock removed from basements and main floors, commingled with belongings, belongings that now appear just as rubble but before the flood were baby pictures, wedding pictures, letters from relatives that may not even be living any longer, priceless family mementoes, the things that make a house a home, all destroyed in the water's wrath.

That has left the people of Grand Forks, N.D. in a very terrible situation. We have literally hundreds of homes in the flood water, and I commend the city leaders because they are